IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI EASTERN DIVISION

FRIEDRICH WILHELM WAFFENSCHMIDT, ANNA WAFFENSCHMIDT and SUNBURST FARMS, INC.

PLAINTIFFS

VERSUS

NO. EC83-81-WK-P

JACK W. MACKAY, JR.

DEFENDANT

SPECIAL VERDICT

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY:

Please begin with Question No. 1. Please answer all questions in numerical order.

777.30

This 12 day of 1c, 1954

Norman L. Gillespic, Clerk

Deputy Clerk

exhibit 961

H&B 191175

in re: baserall antitrust litigation 42872

Question No. 1 (Common Law Fraud)

Do you find that Jack W. Hackay, Jr. committed a fraud upon the Waffenschmidts?

Yes ____

If your answer is "no", please go on to Question No. 2. If your answer is "yes", what amount do you find is the difference between what the Waffenschmidts paid for what they purchased and the value of what they received in turn?

Answer in dollars: \$______

Question No. 2 (Breach of Contract)

Do you find that Jack W. MacKay, Jr. breached the warranties in the Memorandum of Understanding?

Yes ____

If your answer is "no", please go on to Question No. 3. If your answer is "yes", what amount do you find will adequately compensate the Waffenschmidts for these damages suffered as a consequence of the breach of warranties in the Memorandum of Understanding by Jack W. MacKay, Jr., which damages were reasonably foreseeable at the time the Memorandum of Understanding was signed?

Answer in dollars: \$ 15.000 ..

H&B 191176

IN RE: BASEBALL ANTITRUST LITERATION 42873

Question No. 3

3(a) (Material Misrepresentations in Connection with Sales of Stock)

Filed 06/29/2007

Do you find that Jack W. MacKay, Jr. was a controlling person or a substantial factor or materially aided in the sale of shares of Sunburst Farms, Inc. to the Waffenschmidts and that he either had knowledge of the material misrepresentations or, in the exercise of reasonable care, could have learned of such misrepresentations?

	· /.
Yes	$\underline{\nu}$
No	

3(b) (Fraudulent Misrepresentations in Connection with Sales of Stock)

Do you find that Jack W. MacKay, Jr. knowingly or recklessly either made fraudulent misrepresentations or aided and abetted others in doing so, upon which representations the Waffenschmidts justifiably relied in purchasing shares in Sunburst Farms, Inc.?

Yes	<u> </u>
-	
No	

3(c) (Failure to Disclose All Material Matters Requires Registration of Shares)

Do you find that Jack W. MacKay, Jr. failed to disclose fully and accurately to the Waffenschmidts all material matters relating to an offer or sale to the Waffenschmidts of shares in Sunburst Farms, Inc.?

Yes	<u>\(\nu\)</u>
No	

- 3 -

H&B 191177

IN RE: BASEBALL ANTITRUST LITERATION 42874

3(d) If your answer is "no" to all three subparts of Question No. 3, please go on to Question No. 4. If your answer is "yes" to any one or more of the three subparts of Question No. 3 for either or both of the transactions closing on March 19, 1982 (the "First Closing") and June 2-4, 1982 (the "Second Closing), your verdict for damages should be the following:

- (i) For the First Closing
 - (A) amount paid at First Closing \$3,300,000 (b) plus interest at 8% per year 680,917 \$3,980,917
- (ii) For the Second Closing
 - (A) amount paid at Second Closing \$2,401,698
 (B) plus interest at 8% per year 459,866
 \$2,861,564
- (iii) Plus reasonable costs, including attorneys' fees stipulated by the parties \$ 400,000

If you find MacKay liable in respect to both the First and Second Closings, then your verdict for damages will be for the amounts in (i), (ii) and (iii).

Alternatively, if you find MacKay liable only for the First Closing, then your verdict for damages will be the amounts in (i) and (iii).

If you find MacKay liable for only the Second Closing, then your verdict for damages will be the amounts in (ii) and (iii).

Amount in dollars:

\$ 7. 242,481

H&B 191178

IN RE: BASEBALL ANTITRUST LITIDATION 42875

Question No. 4 (Racketeering Activity)

Do you find that Jack W. Hackay, Jr. violated the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act of 1970 with respect to the Plaintiffs by engaging in "a pattern of racketeering activity" as defined in the Court's instructions?

Yes _____

If your answer is "no", please go on to Question No. 5. If your answer is "yes", what amount do you find will adequately compensate Plaintiffs for their damages resulting from the violations of Section 901(a) of the Racketeer Inflenced and Corrupt Organizations Act by Jack W. MacKay, Jr. multiplied by a factor of three, plus the reasonable costs of this suit to Plaintiffs, including stipulated attorneys' fees?

Answer in dollars and cents:

a. Damages

\$ 166.000

b. Trebled
 (multiply amount in
 line a by 3)

\$ 300.000

 Add stipulated reasonble costs, inclu-. ding attorneys' fees incurred by Plaintiffs

400,000.00

d. Verdict for Plaintiffs (add b and c)

\$ 760.00C

. 5 _

H&B 191179

IN RE: BASEBALL ANTITRUST LITIGATION 42876

Do you find that Jack W. MacKay, Jr. converted farm machinery and equipment of Sunburst Farms, Inc.?

Yes V.

If your answer is "no", please go on to Question No. 6; provided, however, if your answers are also "no" to Question Nos. 1 and 2, you are to answer no further. If your answer is "yes", what amount do you find will fairly and adequately compensate Sunburst Farms, Inc. for the loss of its property resulting from the acts of conversion of Jack W. MacKay, Jr.?

Answer in dollars

\$42,200

Question No. 6 (Punitive Damages - the Waffenschmidts)

If your answer to either of Question Nos. 1 or 2 was "yes", and if you find that the conduct of Jack W. Hackay, Jr. involved intentional wrong, malice, wilfullness or callous and reckless indifference to the rights of others, then you may assess punitive damages against Jack W. MacKay, Jr. as you find appropriate.

Amount of punitive damages in dollars

\$ 500.000

Question No. 7 (Punitive Damages - Sunburst Farms, Inc.)

If your answer to Question No. 5 was "yes", and if you find that the conduct of Jack W. MacKay, Jr. toward Sunburst Farms, Inc. involved intentional wrong, malice, wilfullness or callous and reckless indifference to the rights of others, then you may assess punitive damages against Jack W. MacKay, Jr. as you find appropriate.

Amount of punitive damages in dollars

\$100.000

Dated: CIT 17 1984 Bellie Lean Of JURY FOREHAN

H&B 191180

in re: baseball antitrust litigation 42877

Exhibit 3

H&B 191181

IN RE: BASEBALL ANTHRUST LITIGATION 42878

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

United States Bistrict Court	DISTRICT
Antice States State Court	NORTHERN, MISSISSIPPI
CASE TITLE	DOCKET NUMBER
FRIEDRICH WILHELM WAFFENSCHMIDT, ANNA WAFFENSCHMIDT and SUNBURST FARMS, INC	EC83-81-WK
	NAME OF JUDGE OR MAGISTRATE
JACK W. MACKAY, JR.	WILLIAM C. KEADY

- Jury Verdict. This action came before the Court and a jury with the judicial officer named above presiding. The issues have been tried and the jury has rendered its verdict.
- Decision by Court. This action came to trial or hearing before the Court with the judge (magistrate) named above presiding. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED

That the plaintiffs FRIEDRICH WILHELM WAFFENSCHMIDT and ANNA WAFFENSCHMIDT, do have of and recover from the defendant, JACK W. MACKAY, JR., the sum of \$7,858,081.00, less the sum of \$3,000,000.00 which has been heretofore paid to these plaintiffs by settling parties, which reduces the award to the sum of FOUR MILLION, EIGHT HUNDRED FIFTY-EIGHT THOUSAND, EIGHTY-ONE DOLLARS (\$4,858,081.00).

IT IS FURTHER C' ERED AND ADJUDGED that the plaintiff SUNBURST FARMS, INC., do have of and recover from the defendant, JACK W. MACKAY, JR., the sum of TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-SIX THOUSAND, SIX HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$226,600.00).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the above sums awarded to plaintiffs, \$4,858,081.00 to the Waffenschmidts, and \$226,600.00 to Sunburst Farms, Inc., shall bear interest at the rate of 11.36 per annum from date until paid.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that all costs are taxed to the defendant, JACK W. MACKAY, JR., for which let execution issue.

CLEAK	DATE
NORMAN L. GILLESPIE	10/17/84
(BY) DEPUTY CLERK	
Man S. Con 1 Mary S. Guyton	

H&B 191182

IN RE: BASEBALL ANTITRUST LITIDATION 42879

Exhibit 4

usa 191183

in re: baseball, antitrust litigation 42880